

**From:** Pamela Drago  
**To:** 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'  
**Date:** 12/7/01 4:44pm  
**Subject:** Hello,

Hello,

Just an interesting bit I noticed in a prior USA Today article regarding Microsoft's request for the EU to accept the conditions of the US antitrust settlement: "Microsoft warned (the EU) against what it called a "sweeping remedy" that it said would enable its largest rivals - such as IBM and Sun Microsystems Inc. - to develop nearly identical "clone" software at relatively little expense." Excuse my naivete, but wouldn't it be in the best interest of consumers to HAVE CHOICES of similar software at competing prices?

Looking at the history of Microsoft, a good number of their software products and systems were based on ideas developed by other companies (eg. Apple, IBM) and then produced by Microsoft for a lower cost to consumers due to their financial abilities to mass-produce. The opportunity for the tables to turn is now here, and Microsoft is decrying the very process that allowed it to become the powerhouse it is today. Competition is necessary for a strong economy and for consumer satisfaction. If Microsoft products are truly the "best" for the customer (rather than just the only ubiquitous choice out there), then they will maintain their stronghold in the industry. However, if consumers find that products from competitors offer greater programming options and overall product stability, then so be it. Either way, it should be up to the consumer to decide-not the company who has the most to lose.

On final note, Microsoft tends to speak on behalf of the consumer quite a bit, stating that we (the consumer) would be "hurt" by the potential consequences of this case. That's like my state senator saying that the residents of Washington state would suffer greatly if she took a pay cut.

Thanks for listening.

Sincerely,

Pamela Drago  
Seattle, WA